

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

By the present Amendment, claims 1 and 6 have been amended to more fully define the features of the present invention. Claims 18 and 20 have also been amended to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. The amendments to claims 18 and 20 are not made for patentability reasons and do not narrow the scope of the claims. Claims 1-10 and 17-20 are all the claims pending in the Application, with claims 1 and 6 being in independent form. Claims 1-10 and 17-20 stand rejected.

II. Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 18 and 20 due to informalities. The informalities noted by the Examiner have been corrected as set forth above. Thus, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,852,660 to Lindquist *et al.* (hereinafter “Lindquist”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for *at least* the reasons stated below.

According to the MPEP, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP § 2131. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, and 17-20 positively recite limitations which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Lindquist.

A. Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 requires (among other things):

receiving, from a first network, a packet containing first address data conforming to said first network format and second address data conforming to said second network format...

The grounds of rejection allege that the user inputted called party address (Cdpa) specified by the Signaling Connection Control Part ("SCCP") parameters (e.g., TT = 3 and GTS = 05511), as disclosed in Lindquist, correspond to second address data conforming to said second network, as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree with the grounds of rejection.

In contrast to the recitations of claim 1, Lindquist does not disclose or suggest receiving, from a first network, a packet containing first address data conforming to said first network format and second address data conforming to said second network format. In fact, Lindquist discloses quite the opposite—that the International STP¹ Gateway 385 receives a signal from ANSI² SS7³ network 380 containing data (including a calling party address and a called party address), wherein such data conforms to the ANSI SS7 format alone.

Indeed, Lindquist discloses a system and a method for reformatting and converting SCCP parameter values, which conform to the ANSI SS7 standard, into corresponding SCCP parameter values, which conform to the CCITT⁴ SS7 standard. See column 5, line 65- column 6, line 1;

¹ "STP" = Signal Transfer Point

² "ANSI" = American National Standards Institute

³ "SS7" = Signaling System No. 7

⁴ "CCITT" = Consultative Committee On International Telephone & Telephony

column 7, lines 24-25. Specifically, Lindquist discloses that the International STP Gateway 385 receives a signal from the ANSI SS7 Network of the United States 380. *See* column 7, lines 35-44; column 6, lines 44-47. Moreover, Lindquist discloses that this signal contains a calling party address (Cgpa) and a called party address (Cdpa), which are both specified by SCCP parameters conforming to the ANSI SS7 standard. *See* column 7, lines 35-40.

Thus, Lindquist discloses that the converter 370 (located within the International STP Gateway 385) then converts the SCCP parameters conforming to the ANSI SS7 standard into the appropriate CCITT SS7 formatted values using a conversion table or register 372. *See* column 7, lines 42-46; column 7, lines 7-26. Finally, Lindquist discloses that the International STP Gateway 385 transmits a signal containing the appropriate CCITT SS7 formatted values to the CCITT SS7 network of Europe 309. *See* column 6, lines 44-47.

Therefore, Lindquist merely discloses that the International STP Gateway 385 receives a signal containing data (including a calling party address and a called party address) conforming to a single network format alone (i.e., the ANSI SS7 standard). Lindquist further discloses that the International STP Gateway 385 converts this signal into a second network format (i.e., the CCITT SS7 standard) using a conversion table. That is, Lindquist discloses nothing more than an address converter of the type discussed in the specification of the present application, which uses a database that maps the addresses of a first network to corresponding addresses of a second network. *See* Specification page 1, lines 19-22. Accordingly, Lindquist does not disclose or suggest receiving, from a first network, a packet containing first address data conforming to said

first network format and second address data conforming to said second network format, as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by (i.e. is not readable on) Lindquist for *at least* these reasons. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims 2-5 and 17-18 are allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

B. Independent Claim 6

Independent claim 6 requires (among other things):

receive means for receiving, from said first network, a packet containing first address data conforming to said first network format and second address data conforming to said second network format...

In view of the similarity between this requirement and the requirement discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 apply at least by analogy to claim 6. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is patentably distinguishable over Lindquist for *at least* these reasons. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claims 7-10 and 19-20 are allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 6. Thus, the allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 5, 8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindquist in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,897,841 to Gang Jr. (hereinafter "Gang"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for *at least* the reasons stated below.

In order for the Examiner to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, Lindquist, Gang, or some combination thereof, must teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 3, 5, 8, and 10. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Lindquist, Gang, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of claims 3, 5, 8, and 10.

Claims 3 and 5 incorporate all the novel and nonobvious recitations of their base claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 3 and 5 are allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Claims 8 and 10 incorporate all the novel and nonobvious recitations of their base claim 6. Consequently, Applicant submits that claims 8 and 10 are allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 6.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Serial No. 09/406,803

Attorney Docket No.: Q56006

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 15, 2004